

Serial No.: 10/806,734
PD030039
Customer # 24498
May 25, 2007

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Applicant submits herewith replacement drawing sheets for incorporation into the application file.

The replacement drawings provide the figure designations in capital letters (i.e., FIG) as per the Examiner's request. No new matter has been added by these replacement drawings.

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action mailed March 8, 2007 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Claims 1-14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 15-20 have been added. Claims 15-20 are now pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 have been objected to for some matters of informalities. The claims have been canceled from the application, and as such, this objection is now moot.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott et al. (USP 5,097,518). Claims 1-14 have been canceled from the application. As such, this rejection is now moot.

Claim 8 stands further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Intell 80386 computer first produced in 1986. Claim 8 has been canceled from the application. As such, this rejection is now moot.

In this response, applicant has submitted new claims 15 - 20 for consideration by the Examiner. It is believed that these claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited patent to Scott et al.

New independent claim 15 now refers to a method for arbitrarily selectable scaling of input images represented by pixels or sub pixels arranged line by line and column by column. The method includes distributing a number of support points corresponding to a number of pixels or sub pixels in the output image across the lines or

columns of the input image. Distribution is effected in such a way that the support points have distances corresponding to a number of integer pixels or sub pixels. Distribution is further effected in such a way that the distances between the support points in a line or column have a minimum variation from one another. The ratio of the number of support points to the number of pixels or sub pixels in a line or column corresponds to the desired scaling factor. This feature is supported in the original specification on page 3, line 31 to page 4, line 3. The method also includes the step of selecting or calculating a pixel or sub pixel value for a pixel or sub pixel in the output image from pixel or sub pixel values in the input image lying between a corresponding support point and a neighbouring support point. Selecting is supported on page 3, line 31 of the original specification. Calculating from a range of pixels between two support points is supported on page 4, lines 3 to 10 of the original specification. The method further includes the step of distributing the support points of two successive lines or columns such that the support points of one line have an offset with respect to the other line. For example, when support points of a first and a second line are distributed across the respective line, they do not fall within the same columns. This feature is supported on page 5, lines 1 to 8 of the original specifications.

The Examiner stated that Figure 4A of the prior art presented in US 5,097,518 A (Scott et al.) depicts offsets by whole pixels for successive lines or columns. However, this is a fixed offset which is the same for both successive lines and columns and which is referred to the first pixel in the line. In the prior art, the support points of two successive lines fall within the same columns. Therefore, providing an offset between support points of successive lines or columns clearly results in an improved detection and

reproduction of fine details in the scaled image. In particular, in the case when fine details are present as horizontal or vertical lines. This particular advantage is mentioned in the original specification on page 5 in lines 4 to 6.

The prior art clearly fails to disclose this feature of the claimed present principles, and also does not mention or suggest the problem of fine details disappearing when support points are selected at regular distances reoccurring across successive lines or columns. Therefore the principles as claimed in new independent claim 15 are believed to be novel in view of the cited art.

New dependent claim 16 refers to determining the values for neighbouring pixels in the output image from the pixels between a corresponding support point and a neighbouring support point in such a way that the neighbouring pixels in the output image have a maximum difference. In other words, if, for determining a first pixel in the output image the minimum value of the corresponding range of pixels between two support points in the input image has been selected, for determining the second pixel in the output image the maximum value of the corresponding range of pixels between two support points in the input image will be selected. This feature is supported on page 4, lines 6 to 10 and the description of the second embodiment beginning on page 12, line 14 of the original specification.

The prior art does not disclose selecting pixel values in the input image to form an output image such that successive pixel values in the output image have the maximum possible difference.

Serial No.: 10/806,734
PD030039
Customer # 24498
May 25, 2007

New dependent claim 17 refers to using pixels located on both sides of a support point for determining a pixel in the output image. This feature is supported on page 4, lines 14 to 15 of the original specification.

New claims 18 and 19, 20 essentially correspond to former claims 8 and 12, referring back to independent claims 15.

Having addressed all grounds for rejection by deleting claims and adding claims that are new and non-obvious over the prior art it is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections and allow the claims on the merits.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Office Action of March 8, 2007 be withdrawn, that pending claims 15-19 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No.07-0832

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREAS LOEW

Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 28,234
609-734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
2 Independence Way, Suite 200
P. O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312